

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1997

ing this living memorial project in his role as Reserve recruiting officer at Treasure Island Naval Base.

Having been a personal friend of the late Admiral Callaghan, his distinguished brother Vice Adm. William Callaghan, retired, and Judd Callaghan, it is my great pleasure to bring this program to the attention of our colleagues.

The Criterion, Weekly Publication of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Indianapolis, Endorses Youth Conservation Corps and National Service Corps Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "New Peace Corps," which was published in the February 22, 1963, issue of the Criterion, the weekly publication of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Indianapolis.

I think this editorial is one of the finest I have seen on the importance of these two proposals of President Kennedy and on the way in which the President has responded to the needs and problems of young people.

The editorial follows:

NEW PEACE CORPS

One of the side effects of having a youthful President, surrounded by youthful advisers, seems to be—quite naturally—a knowledge of the special needs of youth.

Mr. Kennedy has captured the imagination of the country's young people by offering to them the challenges and opportunities to contribute toward the common good. Whether it be physical fitness (with or without 50-mile hikes) or the Peace Corps, response to the administration's programs has been marked by typical youthful exuberance.

Even the severest critics of the Peace Corps a short time ago have now completely reversed themselves because of the project's dazzling success around the world. In fact, the current 9,000 authorized limit for the Peace Corps will probably be extended by Congress to 13,000 volunteers to keep pace with the demands.

Last week President Kennedy, in a special message to Congress about youth, called for the establishment of two new programs—a domestic service corps and a renewed appeal for a Youth Conservation Corps for jobless young people.

The proposed National Service Corps is "urgently needed," according to the President, to provide aid in mental health centers, hospitals, Indian reservations, migrant labor camps and organizations serving slums or poverty-stricken rural areas. As outlined, the project would ultimately involve 5,000 volunteers. It would be administered by local professional personnel on locally planned projects.

The Youth Conservation Corps, similar to the old Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) in the depression years, is intended by President Kennedy to give work to some young

people who can't find jobs. One phase of this proposal would employ 15,000 young people initially to improve forests and recreation areas. It could ultimately be expanded to include about 60,000 in this work.

Another phase of the Youth Conservation Corps could be implemented in cities facing chronic unemployment. Matching Federal funds would be made available to local communities for hiring jobless young people for work in nonprofit community service organizations—hospitals, schools and settlement houses.

Every sizable community has problems of school dropouts resulting in a surplus of unskilled jobseekers. The unemployment rate among young people is more than twice the national average, even higher among minority groups and among those who don't finish high school.

We believe the administration's proposals for youth are sound. The amount of money required to implement them is small compared with the vastness of the needs and the good the programs could accomplish.

Half of New Jersey Bays Closed to Shellfishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Philadelphia (Pa.) News of October 15, 1962, pointing out that half of the New Jersey bays are now closed to shellfishing because of pollution. The economic loss of this pollution will run into millions of dollars. This is one more reason why additional vigor is required in Federal, State, and local activities to abate pollution of our rivers, streams, and offshore waters.

The article follows:

HALF OF NEW JERSEY BAYS CLOSED TO SHELLFISHING

For several years New Jersey's inland waterways along the coast have been contaminated. This year, however, the pollution is so bad half the areas have been closed to shellfishing.

The ban covers clams, oysters, and mussels; not crabs. The economic loss is expected to run into the millions.

Behind the ban is prevention of hepatitis which can result from eating contaminated shellfish.

Areas affected extend from Raritan Bay to Cape May. Worst spots, it is reported, are at Atlantic City, Margate, Ventnor, Absecon, and Pleasantville.

A Cape May County health official called the situation there "terrible." A State conservation man estimated half of New Jersey's shellfish areas have been condemned.

Chief contamination cause is growth of seashore communities, officials said. Over-taxed sewage systems result in only partially treated wastes, which spill into the backwaters and sink to the oyster and clam beds. Then tides spread it.

Also blamed are industrial waste, failure of some sewage systems to work properly, and overflowing of cesspools and septic tanks. Laws on sewage disposal are adequate, one official noted, but often are hard to enforce.

"How can you check on every marina?" he asked.

Farmers Want Program That Will Enable Them To Compete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, our Democrat friends are fond of accusing Republicans of not being sympathetic with the economic problems of farmers. The record, of course, does not justify such a ridiculous contention and the voters in the principal farm States have indicated in the past couple of elections that they believe their economic well-being is best served by Republicans. Farmers in farm States have indicated with their votes that they do not buy the Kennedy-Freeman and company, economist-conceived supply-management idea of farm legislation. Farmers want a program that will enable them to compete in an economy that contains built-in price protection for other segments of our economy, but retains for the farmer a maximum degree of opportunity to exercise initiative and utilization of their land and management capability. This administration gives lip service to this concept in farm legislation, but every major farm bill sponsored by this Democrat administration has provided for more strict production controls and price management.

I do not have time here, Mr. Speaker, to go into all the failures of this administration so far as farmers are concerned, but just to keep the record straight, I want to point out some recent results of Mr. Freeman's professed effort to help farmers.

The Department of Agriculture, in a release dated March 29, 1963, reveals that the parity ratio of prices received by farmers on March 15 was 77. The report says:

The parity ratio slipped off 1 point to 77, the lowest since 1959.

This is hardly a solid achievement in the area of improving conditions for agriculture in general.

Let us look at cattle prices. The USDA report referred to above states:

Beef cattle, at \$19.60 per hundredweight were the lowest for the month since February 1960.

It is a well-known fact that fat cattle have suffered a decline in price of 7 cents per pound since December. This is a loss of \$70 per head or more on every fat steer or heifer a farmer is sending to market. If this is a side effect of Mr. Freeman's management of feed grain prices, I doubt that cattle feeders are impressed with the results.

Now let us take a look at hogs. The USDA reports that at \$13.70 per hundredweight hogs were lower than in any month since 1960. I am advised today hogs are selling for \$13.10 at country buying points in Iowa.

This March report of the Crop Reporting Board of USDA is reporting facts as it traditionally has for many years. These facts must not be a great comfort

April 3

A1998

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

to Kennedy, Freeman and company and we could perhaps wonder how long before the White House news management policy will be applied to the Department of Agriculture's role of providing factual statistical information for farmers.

Let us look briefly at some other direct quotations from the report:

The commercial vegetable index dropped 8 percent during the month.

The March Index (for dairy products) was 3 percent below a year earlier and lowest for the month since 1950.

Lower prices for eggs and commercial broilers dropped the index 1 percent during the month to 155.

I point out these instances of declining farm prices as a means of explaining the continued decline of the farmer's parity ratio and more specifically, the farmer's income. I do this for the purpose of keeping the record straight as to the real effect of the administration's farm policies.

Soviet Troops Still in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared recently in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House the Herald Tribune's excellent commentary on the continued presence of Soviet troops in Cuba.

A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

A not-so-funny thing happened on the way to no place at all this week.

At his news conference, President Kennedy was asked a three-part question. Did the administration have accurate information on the number of Soviet troops actually withdrawn from Cuba? Was Mr. Kennedy satisfied with the rate of withdrawal? Was there any arrangement with the Soviets for verification of the withdrawal? "No," said the President, "the answer to your question would really be 'No' to all of them." He grinned. The reporters broke into laughter. And that was that.

It may have been a clever way to handle an embarrassing question, but the answer—or at least its implications—didn't strike us as particularly amusing. Or reassuring.

The situation in Cuba is certainly better today than it was last October, before Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviets to dismantle their offensive missile bases. But it's far worse than it was a year ago, or 2 years ago. And one of the principal reasons is the continued presence of those Soviet troops which, the President acknowledged, are not being withdrawn at a pace he considers satisfactory. Nor are most other Americans likely to consider the pace satisfactory.

The troops may not be preparing to invade Miami, but they do constitute a clear and present danger to the hemisphere. They are in Cuba precisely because it suits Mr. Khrushchev's purposes to keep them there. And we all know what his purposes are.

Khrushchev, Castro and Co. aim to sub-

vert free governments throughout the hemisphere and we have recently been treated to some expert testimony by CIA Director McCone on the extent of Cuban efforts to export revolution. Mr. McCone told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that "at least 1,000 to 1,500 persons" from other Latin American countries went to Cuba in 1962 for training in such subjects as sabotage and guerrilla warfare. Soviet "technicians" can play a major role in such training; they also bolster the Castro regime against threats from the Cuban people. And as long as they remain, the possibility remains that Mr. Khrushchev might clandestinely reintroduce his missiles.

Whatever their activities in Cuba, we can be sure of one thing: we—the free nations of the hemisphere—are the target of those activities. Mr. Khrushchev didn't send his troops to the Caribbean for a holiday, and he isn't keeping them there to spare them a Moscow winter.

The Reds—What Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn Tablet, the weekly publication of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn, N.Y., is one of the most respected and effective publications of this nature in the country.

In its issue of March 28, it carried an article by Louis F. Budenz which emphasizes the obvious fact that aid to Red Poland strengthens Moscow.

In view of the proposals in this year's foreign aid bill which have just been made at the insistence of the administration, showing extremely favorable consideration to Poland and Yugoslavia, I feel this article is extremely timely, and I insert it into the Record at this point:

THE REDS—WHAT NOW?—AID TO RED POLAND
STRENGTHENS MOSCOW

(By Louis F. Budenz)

Praise for Joseph Stalin as "a good Marxist and good Communist," uttered by Khrushchev in early March, to be understandable, must be linked up with a big Kremlin endeavor. As highlighted in the February International Affairs, this is the re-creation of Stalin's victims, the captive nation, into economic battering rams against the West.

The aim of the enterprise, as set forth in that issue's leading article, "Council for Mutual Economic Aid and the Six," is to prove "that the planned socialist economy is superior to the 'coordinated' capitalist economy." The narrative covers the alleged differences between the Red-ruled Council for Mutual Economic Aid and the European Common Market. It is naturally directed against us.

RATES FIRST

The first of Stalin's victims among the captive nations, Poland, now allegedly stands highest as an agency to destroy the free world economically. Of 273 industrial enterprises, constructed in "the Socialist countries" with Soviet technical assistance,

Poland rates first in number with 74. Also, it is pointed out, that "in Poland, per capita power output increased tenfold." There are many other statistics leading to the same effect.

In this connection, it may seem strange that I suggest that you study the March-April 1963, number of Mission. This miniature magazine is a publication of Bishop Fulton J. Sheen. In pointing out the Communist persecution of the Catholic Church, it dwells conspicuously on Red Poland.

We are reminded that Cardinal Wyszyński suffered several years in prison, that 91 priests were killed, 260 disappeared without trace, and that 550 were deported. We are also told that 2,133 Catholic churches were closed. We learn, too, surprisingly, that two priests were sent to prison for 3 years for translating Bishop Sheen's own books into Polish.

His Excellency is not concerned with any political or economic aspects in giving us this review. But we as laymen and as American citizens can soberly ask ourselves: What sort of friendly "image" is the United States creating for itself, as some newspapers suggest, by giving favorable trade treatment and support by aid to this atheistic Communist regime?

The answer was furnished last year by Wladyslaw Gomulka himself. He should know, for he is the head of the Polish Communist Party and the Red Polish Government. Gomulka has given an interview which was bitterly anti-American. The Worker of July 15 and 22 published it in full, and I invite you to look it up.

-SUPPORTS K.

In the interview, Gomulka started right off by saying: "If it depended on the Soviet Union only, the prospect for peace would be very bright indeed." But he showed that the United States was the other big factor in the international scene and that it indicated no desire for peace. From thence on, he supported item by item Khrushchev's demands on the free world. He raised aloft the banner of peaceful coexistence, implying that America opposed such an idea.

Gomulka knew full well that peaceful coexistence had been the slogan under which Poland had been taken over by Stalin in agreement with Hitler. I have in my hand at this moment No. 9 of the Communist International for 1939, the predecessor as directive giver of the World Marxist Review.

There we have the speech of Premier V. M. Molotov of the Soviet Union on "The Meaning of the Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact," in other words, the Hitler-Stalin alliance. His chief thought is expressed thus: "In our foreign policy toward non-Soviet countries, we have always been guided by Lenin's well-known principle of the peaceful coexistence of the Soviet state and of capitalist countries."

So it was, that peaceful coexistence was the excuse for the betrayal of the West, just as it was for every other major Soviet move. In a word, as Gomulka knows, peaceful coexistence constitutes that favorable cover under which Soviet power can best advance at any particular period.

The great weapons of the socialist bloc against us economically are to be twofold, says International Affairs. They are great joint electric power and oil pipeline systems through all the Red-ruled countries and regimented trade with the West. Socialist trade will gain because of its stable prices, which means the cheap results of slave labor. It is no wonder that the Worker of March 17 advertises many Red Polish products along with East German exports as though they represented Communist buying.

A1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 3

tion of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of neutrality. The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke neutrality laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

The Shame of Our Cuban Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, just how far is President Kennedy prepared to go in retreating from all the ideals upon which this Nation of ours is founded? We, who have been the champions of freedom, are now in the strange position of defending Fidel Castro, a ruthless and murdering dictator, against the loyal Cuban people whose crime is that they want to be free and are willing to die to restore freedom to their homeland.

Are we, a once proud people, now going to grovel in the dust under the

bloody heels of Communist gangsters, afraid to protect our own freedoms plus using our might to prevent others from seeking freedom?

The following column, written by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of April 2, 1963, points up the confused thinking of the Kennedy administration. Let us hope the American people will soon demand a rational leadership which is unafraid and determined to protect our freedom, not merely keep the peace. No American worthy of the name can ever accept peace without honor.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA: U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the "clearer idea" has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in south Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to bedcloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a

hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called "neutrality" laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of "neutrality". The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly "neutral".

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's Navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counter-revolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

Predators on the Potomac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the March 1963 Field & Stream chronicling the sad feeling of frustration which lovers of the outdoors feel in connection with the wilderness bill now pending before the Congress of the United States. The article by Mr. Richard Starnes, a distinguished outdoorsman and conservationist, should be read by people interested in leaving a meaningful outdoor heritage

1963

friendship, perhaps with the offer of developing the Orange River hydroelectric project as funds have been supplied for Ghana's Volta River project.

But whereas, as Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams said, the United States gave \$210 million to new African countries last year (not counting agricultural commodities and Export-Import Bank loans), South Africa is not asking for a cent from the United States and never has done so. Nor is South Africa trafficking with the enemies of the West in the slightest degree. It is openly and totally committed to the cause of Western civilization without any inducement from the U.S. Government.

Americans who realize that South Africa is the most logical ally of the United States on the African Continent can only wonder what ideological attachments cause State Department policy planners to turn their face against the Republic. When the United States votes with the Communist bloc and the neutralists against the interests of South Africa, the United States votes against its own security—its own investments and its own need for naval and air bases in time of world conflict.

Nothing in all of Africa is more important in the cold war than keeping sea communications around the Cape of Good Hope in Western hands. If a Communist regime were to occupy Cape Town, it would represent a terrible threat to the United States, England, Australia and associated countries.

Of equal importance is keeping South Africa's tremendous industrial machine and wealth of natural resources in the free world camp. If revolution should take place in South Africa, or if that country should be plunged into chaos as a result of outside interference, the only industrial power in Africa might fall into the hands of the Sino-Soviet bloc. South Africa's gold supplies, so essential to the Western economy, would then be an extra tool with which the Communist world state could prepare America's burial.

A free, Western-oriented South Africa is a major source of strength for the United States and its Allies. Indeed one can be sure that unless subverted by Afro-Marxists and their masters in Moscow and Peking, South Africa will be the industrial colossus on the African Continent in the years ahead. Already, while other African states talk of the beginnings of generating electric power, South Africa is buying its first nuclear reactor.

Thousands of university students, trained by professors who received their education at Iowa State, Cornell, Stanford, Oxford, the Sorbonne, and the University of Berlin, are being graduated from South African institutions. The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research is putting these students to work in development of the most modern type of economy.

What this adds up to is realization that South Africa is the key to the future of Africa and the one essential ally for the United States on a continent that will be involved in the shaping of the world in the next half century or more.

In all likelihood, South Africa is the only nation in Africa that has a destiny as a major power on a par with European countries. The reasons are clear: a European population with high standards of education, tremendous investment in science, mineral riches, abundant lands for growing food, a super rail and air transportation system, a free press, established parliamentary government, and a vigorous way of life steeped in the values of the Christian faith and European civilization. In short, the South Africans are the Americans of the African Continent.

While South Africa should enjoy the confidence and sympathy of the U.S. Government and the American people, the truths are ob-

scured by the lies told about the country. Indeed it must be the most lied about nation on earth. But statistical studies of the country are eye opening to those who are willing to see the truth.

South Africa, for example, produces 85 percent of the coal in Africa and 92 percent of the gold on the continent. The Republic is a big producer of iron ore, and shipments of pig iron to Japan will be a major item in its overseas trade during the next few years. In addition, South Africa produces 64 percent of the gold outside of the U.S.S.R., 48 percent of the world's platinum; 39 percent of the gem diamonds; and is the third largest producer of chromium, manganese, and uranium. This is only part of the story of its mineral wealth (its supplies of coal are practically unlimited), and thus South Africa is the prize on the African Continent. Is it any wonder that the Communists wish to dominate its Government?

Industrialists from many nations have commented on the wealth and power of South Africa. Mr. Takeo Haraguchi, director of one of Japan's largest industrial companies, Hitachi, Ltd., recently compared three industrially growing countries—South Africa, Australia, and Brazil. He declared that South Africa in a decade will be in a very high state of industrialization and that, with the resource of gold, it will be one of the most economically secure economies in the world.

Dr. Anton Rupert, one of South Africa's leading industrialists, has asserted that his country could become the workshop of the continent of Africa. He has pointed out that South Africa is the obvious and natural leader of Africa. Although only 4 percent of Africa in area, South Africa is responsible for 30 percent of the production and income of the continent.

An American observer whose views deserve the closest attention is former U.S. Ambassador Philip K. Crowe. Ambassador Crowe, who served during the Eisenhower administration, has noted: "America has an important financial interest in South Africa. Our total private investment of upward of half a billion dollars is more than we have invested in all the rest of Africa put together. This investment, moreover, is based on a viable and expanding economy."

Yet there are elements in America that would disregard this United States stake in South Africa precisely as they disregard a similar stake in Cuba and where, like in South Africa, they support a revolutionary change in the form of government. But the truth that should be apparent to every reasonable American is that a Luthull regime in Cape Town would be exactly like a Castro regime in Havana, only more primitive and given to atrocities.

Marcus D. Banghart, vice president of the Newmont Mining Corp., an American business man who knows and understands South Africa and its potential, speaks ably for those U. S. citizens who are appalled at policies that lead to abandonment of the Republic. "The Republic of South Africa," he has said, "is an outstanding example of the benefits to a new land of individual enterprise, capital and know-how."

The sum and substance of the South African industrial story is that the Republic is a prime example of capitalist success. All the people of South Africa, white and Bantu, are profiting from a system that holds even greater opportunities in the future.

The question for Americans is very simple: Do we want South Africa to remain on our side—a part of our world and civilization? Or are we content to see South Africa swallowed up in an Afro-Marxist revolution and, in short order, become a satellite and powerhouse of the Soviet Union or the Chinese People's Republic?

This is the question Americans must answer for themselves.

Kennedy Deterioration in Cuban Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has allowed the action in Cuba to deteriorate to such an extent that it is now critical to the future security of this hemisphere. David Lawrence wrote on this in yesterday's Washington Star as follows:

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA—U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the clearer idea has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way to power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerilla-type warfare in South Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to belaud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only it not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on United States territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the United States Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built MIGs, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erec-

A1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 3

pudiate every freedom fighter who takes up arms against communism.

In Vietnam, young Americans are being killed by Communists with Russia-supplied arms. Yet in the Caribbean, when young Cubans harass their betrayer, Castro, and the Russian occupation, the U.S. State Department deplores it.

STANDOFF

Why? Will the nuclear set now tell us that unless we stop the Alpha 66 raids against Communist Cuba, there'll be nuclear conflict?

This will sound fairly thin, since Defense Secretary Robert McNamara himself last week told Congress that we are in a "nuclear standoff" with Russia.

The U.S. State Department knows very well that the Alpha 66 raids are part of a strategy aimed at overthrowing Castro. Every raid is followed by a burst of sabotage against the Russian occupation. Does our State Department not want this occupation harassed?

Responsible members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tell me they cannot believe the Department spoke seriously against the Cuban patriots. They believe this is another example of our Government's use of the forked tongue—as advocated in the managed news policy. If this is true, the authors of this latest managed lie ought to be taken out of their fear-distorted environment and subjected to the influence of ordinary people who respect courage and hate tyranny.

The U.S. Information Service Chief, Edward R. Murrow, last week pleaded with Congress for a 25-percent increase in his operation's budget. So long as the U.S. State Department's spokesmen are too terrified to stand behind the principle of freedom and to "help our friends," as President Kennedy promised in his election pledges, then all the money spent for U.S. propaganda will be so much paper and tarnishable silver down the drain.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 2, 1963]

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the clearer idea has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla actions such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in South Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to belaud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk: "Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of neutrality. The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

Texas, Minnesota Radio Stations Join in Effort To Save Hemophilia Patient in Baylor Medical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at Baylor Medical Center in Dallas, a 17-year-old boy from Muskogee, Okla., Fred Wallas has received more than 900 blood transfusions, believed to be a record in medical history. Many of the hundreds of donors of blood for this young hemophilia patient were recruited as a result of the efforts of News Director Dick Moore of KBOX radio in Dallas and other members of the KBOX staff, and members of the staff of KDWB of St. Paul, Minn. These radio stations have jointly waged a stirring fight to save a life.

I ask that an editorial from the Dallas Times Herald of March 9, 1963, and an editorial broadcast by News Director Moore of radio station KBOX be printed in the Appendix of the Record as an example of an unusual and stirring public service project.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Mar. 9, 1963]

SIX FLYING TO DALLAS TO AID HEMOPHILIAC

ST. PAUL, MINN.—Six employees of radio station KDWB scheduled a flight to Dallas Monday to donate a pint of blood each to a young hemophiliac.

The station said it is undertaking the project named "Flight for Life," to call attention to the plight of Fred Wallas, 17, of Muskogee, Okla., a patient at Baylor University Medical Center, Dallas, and to National Red Cross month.

Wallas has had nearly 800 pints of blood since he underwent surgery last October.

KDWB announcers and diskjockeys who will make the trip are Hal Murray, Art May, Jim O'Neill, Randy Cook, Don Duchene, and Dan Ronald. They will be greeted on their arrival in Dallas by diskjockeys from station KBOX.

KBOX RADIO EDITORIAL—WRITTEN AND BROADCAST BY DICK MOORE, NEWS DIRECTOR, DALLAS, TEX.

At Baylor Medical Center in Dallas there's a young man from Muskogee, Okla., who needs your help. He is 17-year-old Fred Wallas. Fred holds a dubious distinction. Since he entered Baylor Medical Center last October he has received 800 pints of blood by transfusion, an alltime record in the history of medical blood transfusions. Fred suffers from hemophilia. He is what we commonly refer to as a "bleeder." Authorities at Baylor and at Wadley Blood Center tell us they can see no end to the transfusions. Monday, diskjockeys from two radio stations, KBOX here in Dallas, and KDWB, St. Paul, Minn., join forces in a combined effort to bolster blood donations for Fred Wallas. The six diskjockeys from Minnesota will arrive by Braniff Airlines Monday morning at Love Field in Dallas. They will be met by six air personalities from KBOX. Together the 12 will go to Wadley Blood center and give of their blood.

1963

U.S. Policy on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1960, the then candidate John F. Kennedy said in Johnstown, Pa.:

We must end the harassment, which this Government has carried on, of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and other lands. While we cannot violate international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our Immigration and Justice Department authorities.

This statement is in striking contrast with the State and Justice Department announcements over the past weekend and subsequent United States and British naval action based on those statements.

The following columns by Roscoe Drummond in the April 2 Washington Post, Virginia Prewett in the April 2 Washington Daily News, and David Lawrence in the April 2 Washington Star effectively point out the desperate need for the Kennedy administration to explain its Cuba policy to the Congress and the American people:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1963]

WHY STAND IN THE WAY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Many Americans must feel both confused and frustrated by the difference between what the Administration says about Castro's Cuba and what it does.

Unquestionably, President Kennedy seeks the goal of a "free Cuba." He told the released Cuban invasion prisoners on their return to Florida that he was confident their battalion flag would fly victoriously in Havana.

But when those Cubans hit at the Castro and Soviet forces, the President wants them to stop it.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON tells the graduating class of the Inter-American Defense College that we "cannot be content until communism is gone from Cuba."

But when the Cuban refugees, who are intent upon wresting their freedom from those who have taken it from them, take action to do something about it, the highest officials of the administration express only disapproval.

Thus far President Kennedy has given no adequate explanation as to why he does not want the anti-Castro Cubans to fight the Castro-Soviet forces at any point they can make contact.

Until the administration makes a more persuasive case against the Cuban refugee's harassing their oppressors every chance they get, my instinct is on the side of the refugees.

I think a good case can be made that the refugee raids are useful and that we ought not to discourage them or stand in the way.

We say we want the Castro regime overthrown. We say that only the Cuban people

can bring it about. With those two conditions, who is to begin the process unless it is the Cuban refugees?

You may believe that the hit-and-run raids are only insignificant, hectoring pin-pricks. So were Castro's first hit-and-run attacks on Batista. The only way to begin is to begin.

Remember Hungary? Surely any prudent man could have told the latent and fermenting Hungarian freedom fighters that it would be fantastically foolhardy for them to consider attacking the occupying Soviet tanks with their bare fists and hand-made grenades. But they did. You couldn't have prevented them. And despite the ultimate repression, it was a revolt for freedom which was worth all the bravery that went into it. Hungary is better off today for it.

Admittedly there are risks for the United States in the Cuban hit-and-run raids. Castro might sink an American boat in a spasm of anger. But might it not be better to deal with such an incident than to say that the Cuban freedom fighters must not decide how they shall fight for their freedom?

The administration has said it "will not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil." It can be honestly argued that the refugee raids may provide an excuse for Moscow to keep Soviet troops in Cuba. The opposite may be nearer the truth. Is it likely that finding things calm in Cuba will provide any incentive for Khrushchev to call his troops home?

In 1960 Mr. Kennedy proposed that we would "do more" to help the Cuban resisters "both inside and outside Cuba." Now that the refugees are regaining their morale after the Bay of Pigs, it seems ironic, at the very least, that the United States should send the FBI and the Coast Guard after them.

Telling the Cuban resisters what not to do isn't going to further the cause of a free Cuba. If the administration is convinced that the Cuban refugees are doing it wrong, then at the very least it should be making suggestions and helping them to do it right.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 2, 1963]

U.S. POLICY ON CUBA DEPLORED

(By Virginia Prewett)

The U.S. State Department spokesman who called the daring and gallant Alpha 66 raids on Cuba irresponsible acts that helped Castro's cause, reached an alltime low in pronouncement of U.S. foreign policy.

In Biblical times, the authors of this statement would have assailed young David for going up against Goliath. They'd have said his inspiring victory of right over might "helped the Philistines." And they'd probably have taken away his slingshot.

In colonial times, these spokesmen would have condemned the Boston Tea Party as "irresponsible"—and said it helped the British.

They would have deplored the French maquis' harassment of the Nazi occupation troops while Hitler ruled Europe.

OFFICIAL

For years, U.S. cold war propaganda has hailed the gallant Hungarian Freedom Fighters who challenged Communist power. Yet last week, the world's greatest democracy officially chided Cuba's dedicated young patriots for proving that the fortress Cuba is not invulnerable.

When the State Department calls these raids irresponsible, by inference they re-

Mr. President, on behalf of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the MEA's news release about its award to Mr. Wright be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSMAN HONORED BY TEACHING PROFESSION

Teachers don't always get the apples, occasionally they give them. This happened in Helena when W. Preston "Luke" Wright, of Helena, chief of the Capitol bureau of the Great Falls Tribune since 1945, was awarded the teaching profession's Golden Apple Citizenship Award at the banquet session of the Montana Education Association's annual delegate assembly which met in Helena March 29-30.

The award, consisting of a gold lapel pin in the shape of an apple and a hand-lettered certificate which cited Wright for "contributions to an informed citizenry in the State of Montana," was presented in recognition of "outstanding reporting of affairs of state, and especially for objective news coverage of education at all levels."

Wright was introduced to an audience of several hundred delegates attending the banquet by Mrs. Valborg H. Graham of Billings, chairman of the Montana Education Association's citizenship committee which sponsors the awarding of the honor to a lay person who makes a significant contribution to the advancement of education in Montana. Presentation of the award was made by Maurice Hickey, of Ennis, president of the Montana Education Association.

The Helena newsman, dean of reporters on affairs of state, was nominated for the teaching profession's award for his reporting of legislative affairs, and coverage of meetings of the State board of education and the board of university regents. By translating difficult legislative interpretations and educational terminology into layman's language, Wright has done much through the years to give the public a better understanding of the important educational problems that have confronted Montana citizens.

A native of Indiana, Wright started his newspaper career in Colorado, covering his first legislative session in that State in 1923. In addition to working on papers in Denver and Pueblo, Colo., he has worked on papers in Des Moines and Newton, Iowa. Prior to coming to Helena, he spent a year as a research assistant to the publisher of Business Week magazine in New York City.

A capable speaker who punctuates factual reporting with witticism, Wright has addressed several school administrators' conferences, a summer seminar of administrators at the university, and a Montana Education Association convention. He has a standing invitation to address the Great Falls Rotary Club after every session of the legislature. He is proud of his 25-year pin as a member of the Great Falls Newspaper Guild and his membership (the only one in Montana) in the Education Writers Association, a select national organization.

His wife, the former Lois Swanke, has been operating a reading school in the Capital City for the past 5 years. She is a former public school teacher, having taught at Malta, Chinook, Great Falls, and Helena. The Wright's one son, John, is an engineer at Helena's TV station, KBLT.

troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the clearer idea has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in south Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk: "Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the Inter-American System, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of "neutrality." The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly "neutral."

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's

navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

[From the Washington News, Apr. 2, 1963]
U.S. POLICY ON CUBA DEPLORED
(By Virginia Prewett)

The U.S. State Department spokesman who called the daring and gallant Alpha 66 raids on Cuba "irresponsible acts" that helped Castro's cause reached an alltime low in pronouncement of U.S. foreign policy.

In Biblical times, the authors of this statement would have assailed young David for going up against Goliath. They'd have said his inspiring victory of right over might "helped the Philistines." And they'd probably have taken away his slingshot.

In colonial times, these spokesmen would have condemned the Boston Tea Party as "irresponsible"—and said it helped the British.

They would have deplored the French maquis' harassment of the Nazi occupation troops while Hitler ruled Europe.

OFFICIAL

For years, U.S. cold war propaganda has fanned the gallant Hungarian freedom fighters who challenged Communist power. Yet last week, the world's greatest democracy officially chided Cuba's dedicated young patriots for proving that the fortress Cuba is not invulnerable.

When the State Department calls these raids "irresponsible," by inference they repudiate every freedom fighter who takes up arms against communism.

In Vietnam, young Americans are being killed by Communists with Russia-supplied arms. Yet in Caribbean, when young Cubans harass their betrayer, Castro, and the Russian occupation, the U.S. State Department deplores it.

STANDOFF

Why? Will the nuclear set now tell us that unless we stop the Alpha 66 raids against Communist Cuba, there'll be nuclear conflict?

This will sound fairly thin, since Defense Secretary Robert McNamara himself last week told Congress that we are in a "nuclear standoff" with Russia.

The U.S. State Department knows very well that the Alpha 66 raids are part of a strategy aimed at overthrowing Castro. Every raid is followed by a burst of sabotage against the Russian occupation. Does our State Department not want this occupation harassed?

Responsible members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tell me they can-

not believe the Department spoke seriously against the Cuban patriots. They believe this is another example of our Government's use of the forked tongue—as advocated in the managed news policy. If this is true, the authors of this latest managed lie ought to be taken out of their fear-distorted environment and subjected to the influence of ordinary people who respect courage and hate tyranny.

The U.S. Information Service Chief Edward R. Murrow, last week pleaded with Congress for a 25 percent increase in his operation's budget. So long as the U.S. State Department's spokesmen are too terrified to stand behind the principle of freedom and to help our friends, as President Kennedy promised in his election pledges, then all the money spent for U.S. propaganda will be so much paper and tarnishable silver down the drain.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

NEED FOR ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the need for a fiscally sound method of financing health care in old age has become severe in the past decade. In part, the problem is due to the spectacular progress that has been made in medical technology, which has been a principal reason for the greater numbers of people who live to suffer the illnesses that accompany old age. Changing technology has also rapidly increased the cost of medical care. For the aged, the increasing cost of health care and the increasing need for it have not been matched by an adequate method of financing it.

The crux of the problem of paying for health care in old age can be summed up in a few words. The average health costs of people age 65 and over are twice as high as those of younger people while the incomes of the older group are only half as high. A look at the facts is enough to show that there can be no doubt about the magnitude of the problem.

First. Nine out of ten elderly people go to the hospital at least once between age 65 and death. Most people who reach age 65 go to a hospital two or three times before they die; an elderly couple can expect about five hospital stays during their later years.

Second. When a person aged 65 or over goes to a hospital he stays, on the average, 15 days, twice as long as does the average younger person.

Third. Only half of the couples headed by an elderly person have incomes of as much as \$2,500 per year; the comparable figure for younger couples is \$5,300 a year.

Fourth. Only about half of the people 65 or over who live alone have incomes of more than \$1,000 a year; half of the younger people who live alone have incomes exceeding \$2,500 a year.

Fifth. About one-half of the elderly have no health insurance; and much of the health insurance that the other half has is worth very little to them in the event of a serious illness.

Sixth. The cost of a day's care in a hospital more than doubled from 1951 to 1961; during those 10 years the average daily costs went up from \$16.77 to \$34.98. In Minnesota, hospital costs are

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5309

chemistry, and a future leader who will doubtless continue to bring credit to himself and his family, his community, and to his native State.

Mr. President, the event of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was especially meaningful to me because it provided an excellent opportunity to confer with knowledgeable Americans on certain of the problems which today confront veterans. Earlier in the day these citizens had visited the offices of many of the Members of Congress, including my own, to talk over particular areas of legislative interest.

Among those proposals discussed and which has elicited wide support throughout the country was Senate Resolution 48, a bill to amend the Rules of the Senate to provide for a permanent Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As a cosponsor of this measure, along with several other Members, I am convinced that the magnitude and scope of problems and interests now facing veterans requires the establishment of a full time and qualified Senate committee to administer to their needs. Likewise, I am confident that after thorough examination of the situation as it exists today, my colleagues will be moved to agree, and we will proceed to expeditious and favorable action on Senate Resolution 48.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the greatest blessing we have as Americans is the wonderful gift of personal freedom which is denied over half the world.

A senior at the high school in Lander, Wyo., Miss Valerie Goss, expressed in beautiful and compelling prose the meaning of freedom in an essay that won for her State honors in the Voice of Democracy contest.

Freedom is—as Miss Goss so accurately describes it—an intensely personal thing that all of us as Americans possess at birth. We will pass it on to our children only as long as we dedicate ourselves to preserving it.

With the consent of the Senate I should like to place Miss Goss' award-winning essay, "What Freedom Means to Me," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

An intensely personal thing, freedom.

I'm not going to tell you what freedom isn't.

With my own eyes I see freedom around me. It is a quiet thing generally. Young people in a library, or listening attentively to a teacher lecture. It can be as beautifully silent as people praying in a church, or as noisy as political campaigns with brass blaring, cheering and fiery oratory.

Freedom is security—not stocks, bonds, dividends and interest, but security. The right to wake up in the morning and feel alive. The right to experience and feel all the wonders and sorrows of living. I said that freedom is an intensely personal thing, and it is.

Freedom is as small a thing as being able to leave your home in the morning. It grows as the morning grows. A person gets into a car and drives away on a trip crossing State lines and boundaries uninterrupted by police

inspection or a demand for identification. Certainly, this is freedom.

I work—I have worked. I have had a number of jobs. I quit one when school started and was able to choose another that interested me. The freedom to work as one wants to work. When I collect my pay I am free to spend it on the ample bounty that freedom provides. When I pay for a thing, it is mine. I own it. The thing becomes a part of the meaning of me.

There, that's it—the meaning of me. The meaning of me and freedom are so closely allied that it becomes impossible to separate the identities. Most of all, I think that freedom is me. I live in a State of unhampered abundance of myself and my mind. No, not in any conceited or egotistical way, but in a manner that permits me to become, if I accept the responsibility, a fully developed and knowledgeable person.

Laws are made, have been made giving me the right to be myself. I can get angry and criticize the police, the Government—there will be no reprisals, no violence done to me. Sometimes I tend to abuse this privilege and forget the enormous responsibility which accompanies it. If I have this right, then those whom I criticize also have the same right. Their opinions and beliefs are to be respected—by me. I tend to forget it in the complete security that freedom becomes.

And when I realize this, I realize that perhaps the greatest threat to freedom is selfishness.

It is a sobering thought. The kind of a thought that makes me wonder if I have been damaging freedom, my own freedom and sense of security in other ways. I must ask myself, what other freedoms do I enjoy?

I have beliefs. I am entitled to them.

I have ambitions. I am obligated to them.

I have needs and desires, fears, and worries. Yet I am positive that my life will find a way to fulfill and overcome them.

What are the instruments of freedom that allow this? I am safeguarded by law. Laws which are closely and carefully scrutinized for their fairness, for their complete consideration of the individual living the law. No one shall be favored; no one shall be deprived. What a perfect, yet simple and sensible thing is the law. Despite its complexity, it can be reduced to a statement of principles. No one shall be favored; no one shall be deprived. Even those small and annoying representatives of the law, such as stoplights, are there to prevent me from infringement of the security of others' freedom. They, in turn, are respecting me and my rights in such a small thing as stopping for a traffic signal.

When I study at the library on week nights, I often get a great impression of the stacks of books—sentinels of knowledge. Knowledge guarding me and my rights. I have a sense of heritage before so much knowledge. The more I study it, the greater is my sense that all knowledge seems to reaffirm and convince that freedom is the inevitable course of good and right.

I think one of the places most Americans stop and get a sense of freedom is in our massive accomplishments, cities with skyscrapers, gigantic dams, and hydraulic stations—on Mount Rushmore with those serene faces. It takes something massive and big to commemorate the vastness and amplitude of freedom.

And yet, it is so completely a personal thing. Quiet, noisy, small, in any size—freedom is the person who is free. Freedom is the guarantee of the person. To someone like me who is in the process of becoming an adult citizen—freedom is thoroughly linked with the process of maturation of personality.

Yes, freedom is such an intensely personal thing.

CUBA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in the face of the administration's utterances on behalf of the cause of Cuban freedom the weekend action in restricting Cuban exile leaders, together with announcement of the U.S. role in the capture of an exile ship in the Caribbean must make pretty frustrating and unsavory fare for the American public.

The Justice Department has invoked the Neutrality Act to justify a halt to refugee attempts to encourage guerrilla activity in Cuba by showing that there still exists an anti-Castro resistance effort.

It is not hard to imagine the frustration of the quarter million exiles as they watch their nation being raped and ravaged by a Communist regime dominated by European communism, in direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine and every moral tenet to which this Nation has ever subscribed.

The Cubans watched the United States ramrod the half-planned Bay of Pigs invasion and then refuse even to pick the wounded off the beaches. They watched the United States vacillate, and make indecisiveness the cornerstone of its Cuban policy, and last month they saw the issue of Communist Cuba quietly brushed under the rug at Costa Rica.

It now seems to those Cubans—who owe much of their misfortune to the ineptitudes of this Government—that we have done an about face in even the simple concept of right and wrong.

The blockade of which the White House is in such fear has again been imposed, only this time it is a blockade around the exiles themselves while the bearded dictator of Cuba languishes in the safety of our protective coexistence policy.

A realization of the admissions inherent in the administration's antiexile action was not long in coming. The restrictions, at first praised by both parties and the press, are now being strongly questioned.

Yesterday's press carried two excellent editorials which presented some valid political and moral arguments favoring the refugees' position and giving the United States—as the Nation which once symbolized freedom to the world's oppressed people—something to think about.

I recommend to my constituents a Washington Star editorial by publisher and columnist David Lawrence, and an article by Virginia Prewett in the Washington News, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 2, 1963]
POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA—U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000

and invoke neutrality laws against the only individuals who wish to risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

BACK-DOOR FINANCING

(Mr. HARVEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago we learned the Democratic leadership was conducting a secret poll to see if its majority membership would support the action of the House Banking and Currency Committee in reporting out a bill authorizing a \$2 billion increase in lending authorization for the Export-Import Bank with such increase to be financed on a back-door financing basis.

I commend to the attention of the Democratic leadership another poll, an open poll, taken yesterday on the floor of the Senate on the question of back-door financing. The newspaper report in the April 2 Evening Star, over a three-column headline, reports "Transit Bill Is Stripped of Back-Door Financing." The article reports the Senate yesterday, by unanimous action, struck out the back-door financing provision in the reported mass transit bill and substituted therefor the financing of the program under the regular appropriation process. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this should make clear to the Democratic leadership on this side that back-door financing is a "dead duck" in programs to be considered by this Congress.

When the Export-Import Bank bill was considered by our committee in executive session I offered an amendment to place the additional \$2 billion of lending authority under an appropriation process similar to that adopted by the House last year with respect to the \$2 billion increase in authorization for the International Monetary Fund. This amendment was defeated on a straight party vote and the bill was reported with the financing on a back-door basis.

When the Export-Import Bank bill is brought to the floor of the House I shall again offer my amendment to knock out the back-door financing for the increased authorization and subject it to the regular appropriation process. I full well realize, Mr. Speaker, that I may be denied the opportunity of offering this amendment purely because under parliamentary procedure a member of the majority may be recognized to offer the amendment. However that may be, I predict that when the House acts on the Export-Import Bank bill an overwhelming majority of this body will vote to strike the back-door financing provision from the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the language of my amendment, which is the Republican position, to place the financing of the increased lending authorization under the regular appropriation process.

DEMOCRATIC BUGABOOS

(Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, Monday was April Fools' Day, but to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, one might think Halloween somehow had already arrived on April 2.

Certainly the Democrat leader on the other side of the aisle paraded the weirdest assortment of ghosts, goblins, and horror stories within my memory.

The purpose was obvious: to scare the daylight out of the country with trumped-up threats of what will happen if we in the Congress are successful in bringing some semblance of sanity into the Kennedy administration's spending proposals.

Fortunately, there was no more substance to this witch's brew of speculation on what we have in mind in the way of budget cuts than there is in a spook.

And I might add that the timing for this presentation was just about as far off as Halloween itself.

This body had just demonstrated that our position on budget cutting is sound and responsible by chopping something in the neighborhood of a hundred million dollars from the budget of the Department of Interior and related agencies. This figure substantially vindicated the Republican task force projection of this bill, the first we have considered in the current session.

Moreover, President Kennedy had just sent the Congress a message on foreign assistance in which he backed down \$400 million from his original proposal.

I cannot help but wonder what terrifying results our friends on the other side imagine the President's reduction in this program may have on our economy and our foreign relations.

Or does it make a difference just who suggests economy?

Let me again assure my colleagues from the other side of the aisle: we are not going to be frightened off by bugaboos—and I do not think the American people are going to panic, either.

Quite obviously, the administration has been getting a taste of unfavorable public reaction to the idea of planned deficit spending and is responding with some moves of its own in the direction of economy.

This we applaud as at least a step—however reluctantly it may be taken—in the right direction.

As Republicans we do not care who cuts down on excessive spending, just so it is cut.

Meanwhile, we intend to stick by our guns and fight, item by item, for appropriations levels that meet the needs of our economy and our military security and against appropriations levels for which no real justification can be established.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. May I ask my friend if he will not please take the Members of the House and the American people into his confidence and tell them just where these \$15 billion in cuts can be made?

Mr. HALLECK. In due time you will find out. Our projection on the first proposals we had for reduction in the Interior Department appropriation was a little over \$100 million. That projection was proved substantially correct, and I hope it will be proved correct as we go along.

I cannot quite understand the concern of my very beloved friend, the majority leader, who, with a 3-to-2 majority, is so concerned about what we in the minority are going to do in respect to saving money, but we have kept this on a bipartisan basis and we want it kept that way. I must say that, from reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, the folks downtown must have been working nights conjuring up some of those hair-raising yarns.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the gentleman think the American people ought to know and want to know what kind of operation my friends are going to try to perform on the budget?

Mr. HALLECK. We have said we are going to do our best to cut this budget. We obviously cannot do it unless we get some help from the gentleman's side of the aisle, but I am inclined to believe that a lot of people around here, including some folks downtown, are hearing from the country. Beyond that, as I say, we will be responsible in our efforts. I just hope that the people of the country reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, where you have listed the projects that will be gone and the jobs that will be lost and the contractors who will be thus affected—I trust these readers realize that you have already projected these things to come, so we will just go along and prove that projection was far wide of the mark.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], has estimated that our committee has reduced the new obligatory authority by some \$10 billions. Our committee is not putting out the exact figures on the House Appropriation bills in advance. Those committee reports will be released after action by the House Appropriations Committee. I think it would not be wise even for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to release item by item his breakdown before the committee actually takes action. I would hope that the gentleman from Indiana would not release any information until the House Appropriations Committee has had an opportunity to act on each individual bill in executive session.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that was indicated by the chairman of the task force sometime ago.

Mr. ALBERT. May I ask the gentleman one more question: Does not the gentleman feel that the American people are entitled to have the gentleman take them into his confidence?

Mr. HALLECK. I happen to believe that the American people have a little

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

5235

The committee findings are that, even though the Castro Communist forces in Cuba are incapable without outside assistance of successfully mounting an offensive blow, this "does not minimize the Communist threat to inter-American security." The committee then says bluntly that "no plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been put into effect" by the countries of the hemisphere.

The report points out that, because no clear and unified hemispheric policy dealing with the Castro Communist subversive aggression has been developed, some of the members of the Organization of American States "have not devised effective internal methods of controlling subversive traffic in and through their territories."

It is asserted emphatically that Cuba's dependence on the Soviet Union is complete and that the regime "is in fact controlled and operated by trained professional agents from the Soviet bloc." The House subcommittee report states flatly that "the Soviet Union must be held accountable for such subversive aggression in the Americas."

It adds that the "violent overthrow of existing governments remains the unified aim of Communist forces in Latin America," which include both the "Soviet and Chinese branches of international communism."

But what to do about it? The subcommittee makes four principal recommendations, as follows:

"1. In accord with the joint resolution of Congress, October 3, 1962, section (A), immediate steps should be taken by the United States 'to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of the hemisphere.'

"2. The United States should be prepared to act with military force, if needed, in response to the request for help and assistance of any nation of the hemisphere in danger of being overthrown by Castro Communist subversive aggression. This recommendation is in no way to be considered as a substitute for or a bar to unilateral action by the United States in defense of its own security.

"3. Every effort must be made by the United States to assure collective action by the Organization of American States, and by OAS member states individually, toward the curbing of Castro Communist subversive activities and traffic in the hemisphere.

"4. The United States should seek the complete diplomatic and economic quarantine of Communist Cuba by other nations of the hemisphere."

Recommendations of a House committee are influential but do not necessarily mean concurrence by the executive branch of the Government. But it is significant that Members of Congress are setting forth explicitly what they think should be done in Latin America. They have, in fact, stated in much more vigorous terms what American policy should be than has either the White House or the State Department.

The report shows a sympathetic attitude by the committee's members toward economic aid for Latin America, but it is clear they feel that this will not solve the problems of the hemisphere unless stern measures are taken to eliminate the threat of Cuban-based subversive aggression.

There are indications that the Latin-American governments themselves are under heavy internal pressure from radical groups, some of which are not unsympathetic to the Communists, and that this is complicating the whole problem of collective action in the hemisphere. The Soviets have spent hundreds of millions of dollars not only to supply funds, guidance, and technical assistance

to train guerrillas and terrorists brought into Cuba from throughout Latin America, but to infiltrate organizations in various countries. They are leaving no stone unturned to gain a political following inside the countries of the hemisphere. Many organizations are infiltrated by Communists, and the majority of the members are not aware of this underground activity.

The whole Latin-American problem is becoming more and more complicated, largely because the United States has not acted decisively and forcefully in dealing with the Communist base established under the Castro regime in Cuba.

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA

(Mr. STINSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, indeed, to note that one of America's most respected journalists, Mr. David Lawrence, has come to the defense of the Cuban exiles, who are attempting to regain their homeland and rid that island, just 90 miles from our shores, of the Communist menace. As you all know, these efforts are now being thwarted by the latest action of the administration and Great Britain by the enforcement of a blockade around that Communist-infested island, and, which for all practical purposes, would seem to be a protective measure for the welfare of Castro.

I want all of my colleagues to have the benefit of Mr. Lawrence's sound judgment in this matter, and for this reason, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his article entitled "Policy of Inaction Against Cuba," which appeared in the April 2 edition of the Evening Star: [From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA—U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION (By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the "clearer idea" has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in South Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort by the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is an-

nounced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to baffle the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built MiGs, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuba territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of neutrality. The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's Navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately incited the Soviet government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1963

No. 49

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 14: 19: *Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace.*

Almighty God, as we daily pray and labor for world peace, may we be eager to extend the overtures of friendship and good will to all freedom-loving nations who are now being drawn together by a common peril and common ideals.

Grant that we may see clearly that our thinking and acting in terms of all humanity and right relations between the members of the human family are matters of life and death for our world of today.

May we understand that the democracy which we are seeking to establish, and its freedom which we believe is inevitable for all mankind, is one that must be coordinated with discipline and a sense of interdependence, but above all one that has spiritual significance and is ruled by love for God and man.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution to make correction in the enrollment of S. 1035.

THE CONFUSING WORLDWIDE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no program that is any more complex and confusing than the worldwide foreign aid program.

It is estimated that on June 30 there will be on hand, unexpended, but obligated, far in excess of \$7 billion. This is sufficient to meet every legal obligation

that we have outstanding to other nations with respect to foreign aid.

If the Congress, in its wisdom, refused to appropriate another dollar for the foreign aid program, remember, every purely legal obligation we have made will have been met, unless it is assumed that the Executive can obligate money without the prior approval of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll shows that 58 percent of the people approve foreign aid. The Passman poll shows that 98 percent of the people oppose foreign aid. What a contrast. Evidently Mr. Gallup had a carefully worded question that did not deal with the program as it really is.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1963.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: This is the ninth year it has been my privilege to provide you with a recapitulation of foreign aid funds available to the mutual security program. This report covers funds available for fiscal 1963 and covers only the amount of the aid program handled by the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations. Other types of foreign assistance are available under eight other statutes.

The amounts listed on the attached sheet have been verified. These funds are available for obligation and expenditure in the present fiscal year. Funds not disbursed during fiscal 1963 will remain available in either an obligated or reserved status, or as we often say, in the pipeline.

Is it really the desire of Congress to permit AID to continue pyramiding funds and fund programs years in advance of the actual expenditure? This practice accounts for the annual increase in unexpended funds. The certified information presented below indicates there is something wrong with the present system of pyramiding aid funds. Certainly the actual annual expenditures do not justify this practice.

The three brackets of figures cover (a) funds available covering 4 fiscal years—observe the annual increase, (b) actual expenditures for 3 years—fiscal 1963 not yet available, and (c) unexpended funds on hand at the end of the last 3 fiscal years—1963 not yet available:

(A) Total available for expenditure:	
1. Fiscal year 1960-----	\$8,111,521,750
2. Fiscal year 1961-----	8,551,215,000
3. Fiscal year 1962-----	10,078,319,114
4. Fiscal year 1963-----	11,141,987,000
(B) Actual expenditures:	
1. Fiscal year 1960-----	3,265,400,000
2. Fiscal year 1961-----	3,276,600,000
3. Fiscal year 1962-----	3,198,100,000

(C) Unexpended funds:

1. Unexpended funds	
June 30, 1960-----	4,830,549,000
2. Unexpended funds	
June 30, 1961-----	\$5,975,397,000
3. Unexpended funds	
June 30, 1962-----	6,889,186,000

I hope the information contained in this letter and the attached sheet will be of some service to you. It is a pleasure to furnish you the information developed by the subcommittee of which I have the privilege to be chairman. Personally, I am concerned about the ever-increasing cost of this program.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.
(Enclosure.)

FOREIGN OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

OTTO E. PASSMAN, chairman

Foreign aid funds by program and amount (available for expenditure in fiscal 1963)

1. Military assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962-----	\$2,784,637,000
New funds, fiscal 1963-----	1,325,000,000
New funds, other-----	39,985,000
Subtotal-----	4,149,622,000
2. Development loans:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962-----	2,127,005,000
New funds, fiscal 1963-----	975,000,000
New funds, other-----	920,000
Subtotal-----	3,102,925,000
3. Development grants:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962-----	430,252,000
New funds, fiscal 1963-----	225,000,000
Subtotal-----	655,252,000
4. Development grants, special programs: New funds, fiscal 1963-----	2,800,000
5. Surveys of investment opportunities:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962-----	1,500,000
6. Investment guarantees:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962-----	235,659,000
New funds, fiscal 1963-----	30,000,000
Subtotal-----	265,659,000
7. International organization and programs:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962-----	79,009,000
New funds, fiscal 1963-----	148,900,000
Subtotal-----	227,909,000
8. Supporting assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962-----	452,374,000
New funds, fiscal 1963-----	395,000,000
Subtotal-----	847,374,000
9. Contingency fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962-----	223,438,000
New funds, fiscal 1963-----	250,000,000
Subtotal-----	473,438,000

5234

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

Cuba April 3**Foreign aid funds by program and amount
(available for expenditure in fiscal 1963) —
Continued**

10. Alliance for Progress:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962.....	\$519,445,000
New funds, fiscal 1963.....	525,000,000
Subtotal.....	1,044,445,000
11. Administrative expenses, ATD:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962.....	11,233,000
New funds, fiscal 1963.....	49,500,000
New funds, other.....	8,383,000
Subtotal.....	69,116,000
12. Administrative expenses, State:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962.....	87,000
New funds, fiscal 1963.....	2,700,000
Subtotal.....	2,787,000
13. Other: Unexpended, June 30, 1962.....	5,500,000
Subtotal, funds available for ex- penditure for foreign assist- ance program.....	10,848,327,000
14. Peace Corps:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962.....	10,815,000
New funds, fiscal 1963.....	59,000,000
Subtotal.....	69,815,000
15. Ryukyu Islands:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962.....	3,041,000
New funds, fiscal 1963.....	8,900,000
Subtotal.....	11,941,000
16. Cuban refugee program:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962.....	2,687,000
New funds, fiscal 1963.....	70,110,000
Subtotal.....	72,797,000
17. Migrants and refugees:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962.....	2,501,000
New funds, fiscal 1963.....	14,947,000
Subtotal.....	17,448,000
18. Inter-American Development Bank:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962.....	(1)
New funds, fiscal 1963.....	60,000,000
Subtotal.....	60,000,000
19. International Development Associa- tion:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962.....	(1)
New funds, fiscal 1963.....	61,656,000
Subtotal.....	61,656,000
Subtotal, funds available for other foreign assistance.....	293,660,000
Grand total, funds available for expenditure in fiscal year 1963.....	11,141,987,000

RECAPITULATION

1. Unexpended funds (from prior fiscal years, June 30, 1962.....)	\$5,889,180,000
2. New funds (appropriated), fiscal 1963.....	4,203,513,000
3. New funds (reimbursements, sales re- ceipts, etc.) fiscal 1963.....	49,289,000
Total funds available for expend- iture.....	11,141,987,000

¹ \$513,500,000 unexpended funds for IDB and IDA not included in above totals.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1963.

To Whom It May Concern:

Gold holdings (free world countries):	
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1952.....	\$23,252,000,000
U.S. gold outflow to foreign coun- tries, 1952 through 1962.....	-7,195,000,000
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, reduced to.....	10,057,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries, ¹ Dec. 31, 1952.....	13,028,000,000
Gold holdings, increase, other countries, 1952 through 1962.....	+11,630,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries, Dec. 31, 1962, increased to....	24,658,000,000
U.S. dollars owned by foreign coun- tries (free world):	
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1952.....	10,546,100,000
Increase in foreign dollar holdings, 1952 through 1962.....	+14,437,900,000
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, increased to....	24,984,000,000

¹ Does not include Sino-Soviet bloc.

U.S. balance of payments position:

1950 net deficit.....	-\$1,912,000,000
1951 net deficit.....	-578,000,000
1952 net deficit.....	-1,100,000,000
1953 net deficit.....	-2,100,000,000
1954 net deficit.....	-1,500,000,000
1955 net deficit.....	-1,100,000,000
1956 net deficit.....	-1,000,000,000
1957 (only credit in 13 years).....	+500,000,000
1958 net deficit.....	-3,400,000,000
1959 net deficit.....	-3,700,000,000
1960 net deficit.....	-3,800,000,000
1961 net deficit.....	-2,400,000,000
1962 net deficit.....	-2,200,000,000

U.S. deficit, 1950 through 1962,
inclusive.....-24,290,000,000

Gross public debts:

U.S. public debt on Dec. 31, 1962.....	303,470,080,489
Other free world countries (latest available figures).....	201,500,000,000

U.S. debt exceeds debts of other
free world countries by.....101,970,080,489

U.S. debt exceeds all other
countries of world by.....24,000,500,000

The above indicates clearly what the for-
eign aid program is doing to our gold re-
serves and our balance of payments position
(trade).

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Sub-
committee on Appropriations.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on page 5179 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1963, in the fourth paragraph, second sentence, the reporter cited the high in employment as 126,000. It should have read 226,000. In the third sentence of the fourth paragraph, the reporter cited the figure as 76,000. It should have read 173,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rec-
ord be corrected, as follows:

The high in employment in the Veterans' Administration occurred in 1946 when the Veterans' Administration reported 226,000 employees. This year, that figure has been reduced substantially. The Veterans' Ad-
ministration in 1963 reported total employ-
ment of 173,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to
the request of the gentleman from Mas-
sachusetts?

There was no objection.

**SUNDAY TELEPHONE RATES
SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO SAT-
URDAYS AS WELL**

(Mr. HECHLER asked and was given
permission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend his
remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, at mid-
night tonight anyone will be able to place
a telephone call to any part of the coun-
try, station to station, for the sum of \$1
for the first 3 minutes. This is a very
fine move. I would, however, suggest an
additional step which should be taken.
Now would be a good time to extend the
evening and Sunday rates on telephone
calls to Saturdays as well as Sundays.
A great many businesses are closed on
Saturdays and millions of people all over
the country would benefit by this reduc-
tion of rates and the extension of the
Sunday and evening rates to Saturdays.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that I may
be able to generate some sentiment on
Capitol Hill and throughout the country
for this move.

ALLIANCE FOR VIOLENCE

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given
permission to extend his remarks at this
point in the Record and to include ex-
traneous matter.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently
the House Subcommittee on Inter-
American Affairs, of which I am chair-
man, issued a report on "Castro Com-
munist Subversion in the Western Hemi-
sphere."

In the March 30, 1963, edition of the
Washington Evening Star there ap-
peared the following editorial on the sub-
committee's hearings and report:

ALLIANCE FOR VIOLENCE

In its excellent report on Fidel Castro's
captive Cuba, the House Subcommittee on
Inter-American Affairs has made a number
of somber points about how Moscow and
Havana are organizing an alliance for vio-
lence against the free Americas. One of the
most significant of the report's observations
is the following:

"Communist Cuba's dependence on the
Soviet Union is complete. The Castro Com-
munist movement, although claiming to
represent indigenous Latin American inter-
ests and aspirations, is in fact controlled and
operated by trained professional agents from
the Soviet bloc. The Soviet Union must be
held accountable for * * * subversive ag-
gression in the Americas. * * *

"Castro communism is the instrument of
Soviet aspirations for the Americas. Thus
subversive aggression emanating from Cuba
is Soviet directed and represents (in the
words of CIA Director McCone) a 'far more
sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly'
effort than the hastily organized and ill-con-
ceived raids conducted by the Castroites
during the early months of the regime.

International Soviet agents, experts in the
field of revolutionary propaganda, terrorist
tactics, and guerrilla warfare, are operating
schools for violence in Cuba, training and
indoctrinating Latin American subversives.
The Soviet Union as well as its Cuban puppet
regime must bear the responsibility and
consequences for subversive attacks on na-
tions of the Western Hemisphere.

This is but one of the many sobering
findings of the House subcommittee. The
report of the group—a unanimous one,
which is relatively rare—is greatly over-
simplified in these paragraphs. The full text
well deserves the attention and study not
only of the Kremlin but of every American,
including the President, interested in hemi-
spheric security and the alliance for violence
against it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Lawrence, in
his syndicated column of March 19, 1963,
also commented on the subcommittee's
report.

Mr. Lawrence's column follows:

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Evening Star,
Mar. 19, 1963]

**CONGRESSIONAL PLAN TO STALL REDS—REAL-
ISTIC VIEW OF HEMISPHERIC THREAT SEEN IN
HOUSE GROUP'S ACTION PROPOSAL**

(By David Lawrence)

Members of Congress of both parties have
for months expressed serious concern over
the possibility of open military aggression by
Communist forces against the nations of this
hemisphere. A realistic appraisal of the
present situation and a recommendation as
to what should be done have just come
in a unanimous report from the Committee
on Foreign Affairs of the House of Repre-
sentatives. All nine members of the Sub-
committee on Inter-American Affairs—both
Republicans and Democrats—signed the re-
port.